DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 274 983 CS 210 079

AUTHOR Schultz, John
TITLE Locked Apart, Brought Together/The Power of the Speech Writing Relationship.
PUB DATE Mar 86
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (37th, New Orleans, LA, March 13-15, 1986).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Guides - Classroom Use - Guides (For Teachers) (052)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Higher Education; *Integrated Activities; Language Arts; Oral Reading; *Teaching Methods; Writing Improvement; *Writing Instruction
IDENTIFIERS Audience Awareness; *Speaking Writing Relationship

ABSTRACT

Research from various fields supports the crucial relationship of speech and writing. Experience with the Story Workshop used in composition classes can show how thinking, speaking, listening, reading, writing, recalling, and immediate audience focus can be integrated into every phase of the writing process. Activities must enable students find subject matter that intrigues and stimulates them, and over which they have control. The use of group discussion in semi-circles during topic development allows every nuance of oral telling and audience reaction to be either observable or "hearable" to the audience. Literary forms and models that have a built-in sense of audience, such as letters, how-tos, and speeches, are quickly accessible to beginning college students. Well-coached, effective oral reading provides written language a pleasurable integrative pace and demonstration more closely akin to the way perception, thinking, and language come together and function in the actual act of writing. Recall and comment activities use the power of speech to develop memorable principles of the use of written language out of the stimulated and coached behavioral repertory of the students themselves. With coaching while beginning a piece in class, students carry the sense of the immediate audience into the situation where they write alone, fictionalizing the audience, thus stimulating and building their capacity for inner sounding and listening while they write. When reading their in-class writing aloud, students hear immediately the transfer of what occurred in the oral tellings, what occurred in the prewriting mental and oral rehearsal and build-up. In almost every case, there will be effective written language behavior to recognize and build upon, however small. A bibliography of four pages is included. (HTH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

John Schultz
CCCC Presentation
New Orleans, 1986
Writing/English
Columbia College
600 South Michigan
Chicago, Illinois 60605

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
John Schultz
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED274983

Locked Apart, Brought Together/The Power of the Speech Writing Relationship

The speech-writing connection has been treated gingerly, because many teachers have regarded speech as the source, the veritable fount, of error. And the school and the classroom represent a forming and formative image of the desired society. Yet, if speech and writing capacities are brought together, and thinking, speaking, listening, reading, writing, recalling, and immediate audience focus are inter-related, writing comes alive and fills with meaning and learning occurs. Research from various fields instructs us in the crucial relationship of speech and writing.

> Disturbances in oral language are accompanied in practically all cases by equivalent or greater difficulties in written language. This is because writing appears to be "parasitic" upon the capacity for oral communication, and also about as complex a skill as most normal individuals possess. (The Shattered Mind, by Howard Gardner, New York: Random House, Inc., 1974, p. 294.)

In the composition classroom, we cause great disturbances in students' acquisition of written language when we do not allow students to bring their capacity of speech, which is their capacity for language, into play in their writing.

> Genetically we know that speech comes first because children who are blind have no difficult in learning to speak but children who are deaf have great difficulty in learning to read--shutting off the channels of sight has little effect on acquiring language, but shutting off those of sound is almost fatal to it." (Aspects of Language, 2nd Edition, Dwight Bolinger,

New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1968/1975, pp. 468-469.)

When the channels of sound are shut off in our writing classrooms, the results are stultifying to the acquisition of written language, for the meaning of language is inextricably involved with sound and hearing.

When we read "silently," we understand writing through both the eye and the ear, for words without any "inward hearing" of them may have little meaning for us. This inward hearing is different from the crude tremblings of sub-locution, but nevertheless involves subtle throat movements or an "echo" of throat movement. Throat surgeons forbid patients who have undergone throat surgery to do any reading in the recovery period, because of the involuntary, imperceptible throat movement that occurs during reading.

Through hearing comes the earliest sense of audience. It should not surprise us, then, that it is nearly impossible for persons to learn to read and write through sight alone without eye and ear experience of the written language. Yet, that is virtually what is asked of students in a classroom in which writing is to be conceived in silence, read by the teacher in silence, errors corrected or comments made in silence, and the writing handed back to the student in a staccato of silent summary comment.

> Phonetic writing is a great step forward. Writing has become the graphic counterpart of speech. Each element in this system of writing corresponds to a specific element, that is sound, in the language to be represented....A direct relationship has thus been established between the spoken language and the script, that is, writing has become a representation of speech. (The Alphabet, 2 Vol., David Diringer, London: Hutchinson, 1968, pp. 12-13, Introduction.)

In a sixth grade social studies class, students may read the above

statement about the relationship of speech to phonetic writing, but be allowed no such awareness in the sixth grade English class where they are expected to discourse in the medium of phonetic writing. The written language becomes an alien power over which they have little control.

> A dramatic necessity goes deep into the nature of the sentence. Sentences are not different enough to hold the attention unless they are dramatic. No ingenuity of varying structure will do. All that can save them is the speaking tone of voice somehow entangled in the words and fastened to the page for the ear of the imagination. That is all that saves poetry from sing-song, all that can save prose from itself. (A Way Out, Robert Frost, from the Introduction.)

Frost emphasizes some of the essential characteristics of the classroom activities that we can use to develop the power of the speech-writing relationship: the "dramatic necessity," which means the inter-relationship of crucial factors; "holding the attention" of the audience; and with the power of speech, the meaning that can be carried by speech, saving "prose from itself," from emptiness, with the voice somehow fastened to the page for the ear of the reader's imagination.

> Writing was in its origin the voice of an absent person. (Sigmund Freud)

Writing, at its most effective, is still the voice of the person, present on the page, whether the person sits before us in a class or has never been seen by us.

Out of our recent traditions, we still tend to consider writing to be an expression of thinking, what Robert Zoellner called "some largely undefined one-to-one relationship between the thinking process on the one hand and the written word on the other."[1] However, writing to be writing must be speakable, even if it is in the form of an emblema-

tic system, such as the ideographic or heiroglyphic. If we look at the origins of phonetic writing, we find that the relationship that was sought by the inventors was specifically that of speech to writing, element of speech to element of script. The fact that writing, over time and distant from its author, was speakable gave writing its sense of magic for early literates. In modern times we have the accounts of the astonishment of the head-men of the Cherokee at the precisely speakable phonetic script that Sequoyah invented. The Sumerian interest in precision of meaning came about because of their desire to have a clear understanding of the speech of a contract. It was this relationship of speech and writing, reaching its greatest precision with alphabetic writing, that intrigued the inventors of phonetic scripts.

Obviously the relationship of speech to writing deserves our most thorough-going attention and cultivation in the teaching of writing. We should think of it in terms not only of talk and conversation, but of bringing the power of speech, of voice, to bear upon writing and teaching of writing. The amazing thing is that students can respond so quickly and so well, when teachers begin to use approaches that put positive and thorough emphasis on relating the power of speech to writing, and oral discourse forms to written forms.

I will draw upon experience with Story Workshop® activities in teaching composition classes, to show how thinking, speaking, listening, reading, writing, recalling, and immediate audience focus can be integrated in every phase of the writing process. In cases that have been tested comprehensively, comparing results from classes of several

teachers in the Dallas County Community College District, 93% of the students from Story Workshop classes pass successfully the post-test (two hours of argumentative writing), which is necessary to fulfill the composition requirement, while the departmental average is 77% of students passing the test. These figures have not varied by more than a few percentage points every semester for four and a half years.

The problems that are being solved in these Story Workshop composition classes are the familiar problems before most teachers of writing in this country. In "Composition Instruction Does Make a Difference," Betty Ramberg asks, How do we get students to commit to writing and take pleasure in it?[2] For the research shows that if they don't become committed and take pleasure and satisfaction in it, they will not acquire real skill with it.

The same commonsensical expectation of pleasure and challenge holds wherever you find the teaching and learning of complex skills. In sailing, the novice, involved immediately in the whole experience of sailing, puts her or his hand to the tiller to control the boat's direction on the very first day, and then repeats the experience, gaining skill with aspects of it, coached by an instructor, again and again. In almost every sport, the novice performs the sport itself on the first day, coached by an instructor, and then repeats the experience, gaining ability with different challenges that emphasize aspects of the complex skill. If we emphasize the power of speech, the social nature of writing, we bring out the sporting aspect of writing and help students discover urgent, integrative human motivations for learning how to write.

In "Oral and Written Relationships: A Reading Perspective," Brian Cambourne shows us that "the kind of relationship that exists between oral and written language implies a natural and logical set of experiences [which]...should co-occur with one supporting and nourishing the other.

> "Experience 1: Reading the spoken language that one is most familiar with, that is, one's own speech which has been written down.
>
> "Experience 2: Hearing the written language of books, that other more mature users of the written mode have produced.
>
> "Experience 3: Reading the written language that other more mature users of the written mode have produced."[3]

These are not merely the conditions and experiences necessary for children's learning of language. Indeed, it is characteristic of mature users of the language that they take powerful advantage of the rich two-way traffic of speech and writing. In kindergarten students' early writing processes, oral language plays a crucial role in helping the students to formulate, interpret, and elaborate meaning and to seek information from the reader/listener. If this characterizes the beginning stages of an effective process of learning how to write, we need only mention Joyce and Flaubert as mature writers who found that, even in the late stages of composition, the sounding of their prose was essential to finding the "right word" and the right order of words. In "Considerations of Sound in the Composing Process of Published Writers," Charles Cooper and Lee Odell find strong suggestions of positive relationships and use of sound in the work of published writers.[4]

Our thinking-speaking-listening-writing-reading activities, in the immediate audience situation of the classroom, must cope with the

differences between writing and speech. To paraphrase and add to Walter Ong's three main differences:[5]

> The activities must cope with the absence of a speech context, which necessitates the selection of features denoting voice or the recreating of the speech context in writing, getting gesture and all other paralingual expression into writing through appropriate correspondences.
>
> They must cope with the change in medium, from spoken voice to written symbols, which will then be recreated by readers who will understand it with their inward hearing.
>
> They must cope with the absence of the primary audience, which makes it necessary to fictionalize an audience, or to have developed an internal listening and inward hearing sense out of which an audience can be sensed or fictionalized.

If we paraphrase the principles that Robert Zoellner set forth in his "Talk-Write" monograph (1969), we are directed to concentrate on the individual's perception and voice, building from the naive behavioral repertory, working with freely emitted behavior, insuring high frequency of response, reinforcing responses and shaping behavior through intermediate specification of response. We should (1) concentrate on the act of writing, rather than on the artifactual written word, (2) pedagogical exploitation of the verbal repertory, both vocal and scribal, which the student possesses as she or he enters the classroom, (3) a classroom environment so structured as to permit innumerable responses, rather than just a few, (4) a pedagogical situation which permits more or less immediate reinforcement of those aspects of the individual's scribal activity which represent functional improvement, and (5) a clasroom technique for developing chained sub-specifications of acceptable scribal activities geared to the capabilities of the individual student, with error-correction

reduced to a minimum and audience response raised to a maximum.[6] We must make sure Zoellner's definition of scribal includes pre-writing (mental rehearsal and oral telling activities), as well as note-taking, first draft, and rewriting.

Subject Matter and Thinking

Our activities and the conduct of them must permit and enable students to find subject matter that is urgent and intriguing to them, stimulating of their inquisitiveness of how to get what they find they have to say across to an audience. We should begin with subject matter over which the student has knowledge and control, such as how to do something. This lets them bring immediately to bear the authority they have in knowing how to do something and in being able to tell the class how to do it. Thus, not only do we work with the language behavior that the student brings to the class, but also with the content of the student's actual knowledge, experience, and skills.

Teachers observe that writing can be talky without saying much. Research with brain-damaged persons shows that speech can be wholly uncorrelated to meaning or content. Anthropology suggests that thinking (seeing-in-the-mind) preceded the development of the power of speech. Yet, the influence of meaning upon language is broad and powerful, though imperfectly understood. The relationship of speech to writing should be reconceived as the inter-relationships of thinking, the power of speech, and writing.

The Structure of the Classroom Environment Itself--The Semi-Circle

When we use the power of speech to explore as richly as possible the focusing power and integrative motivations of the immediate audience of the class, the seating arrangement becomes particularly important. The structure of the classroom environment itself can impede or facilitate the essentially dramatic, multifaceted activities that we need for developing the language, perception, and content that the student brings to the classroom and can bring into written language. There are variations of small groups and pairings that some teachers use. Actually, we need a format that allows for the privacy of letting the students develop their own material while the focus of demand shifts from one person to another. We need a semi-circle, a nine o'clock through twelve o'clock to three o'clock semi-circle, with the teacher/coach/director sitting in what would be the center of the full circle, facing the group.

The semi-circle allows every nuance of oral telling and audience reaction to be either observable or hearable to the audience, so that we can become keenly aware of the differences between speech and writing while we explore the power of the connections and overlapping of speech and writing. This "seeming" exposure to performance actually produces, when everyone's eyes are focused on whoever is speaking, a sense of listening privacy for the participants in the class. Research shows that peripheral vision is particularly effective for certain kinds of learning. The semi-circle allows for learning that comes from the shifting focus of eyes, rather than having the students' eyes fixed on the teacher. The semi-circle provides the most efficient seating arrangement for the

teacher to coach and otherwise direct the inclass activities.

One teacher observed that even if you have so many students that your semi-circle is ranged against three walls it is more audience-effective than having your students sit in rows or scattered about the room.

The Use of Literary Forms and Models that Have Inbuilt Sense of Audience

Such forms as How-tos, Letters, Speeches with their natural inbuilt second person "you" address, journals with their self-address or any kind of imagined address, and other forms such as stories with their small-group address, are literary forms with an oral discourse base that are quickly accessible to beginning college students. The inbuilt sense of address of these forms allows them to be used with immediate definition in this dramatic classroom arrangement. The process of developing the researched essay will grow out of these forms and will be openly developed in our dramatic classroom. (See the classroom text Writing from Start to Finish, by John Schultz, Boynton/Cook, Montclair, N.J., 1982, for models and discussion of these "basic forms.")

Oral Reading

We need to replicate the conditions of reading and hearing the written language produced by other more mature users of the written mode. Nearly all writers have emphasized the importance of attentive reading in developing writing ability, i.e., reading experientially and analytically. With oral reading, we bring the powers of speech and listening directly

to bear upon writing. The very success of the oral reading makes us acutely aware of the absence of the speech context and the need for inner sounding and listening when we are writing alone. When students read and hear essays, stories, and poems in their own voices, in the voices of peers, and in the voice of the teacher, they become more familiar with the varieties of written language and more able to stretch the potentials of their own voices in writing. Most listeners hear (and "see"), when a passage of literature is read aloud, things that they were not aware of at all, or not clearly aware of, when they read it silently. I have often seen groups of students be extremely attentive to an oral reading of passages of Darwin's Origin of Species, Melville's Moby Dick, or Proust's Swann's Way, amazed that material that had been so nearly opaque when read silently should come through so clearly and compellingly when read aloud.

This is oral reading without the listeners following along with an open text in their hands. They receive the text solely through listening.

We must put a special emphasis upon the quality of the reading and, consequently, upon the teacher's coaching and "making sure" of the reading's potential. The teacher reads the beginning of the selection aloud, but then hands the book to a student who continues the reading. The teacher side-coaches each student's reading for focus and awareness, listening to voice, and perception/seeing/awareness of meaning. For instance, in a beginning class, or with a student who has difficulty in reading, the teacher coaches the student to pick out and read to a single person, address her or him formally as "Dear whoever," and read to that person, in the way that a musician, actor, or other public

performer may pick out a single person in the audience and play to that person, the rest of the audience being unaware that one person is the organizing focus. There are a variety of other coachings that are used and audience situations that are replicated.

Well-coached, effective oral reading provides a strongly pleasureable experience of written language, an integrative pace and demonstration more closely akin to the way perception, thinking, and language come together and function for us in the actual act of writing.

The Reading Aloud of Student Writing

The reading aloud of student work does more than any other single factor to help students discover their pleasure and commitment to writing. To perceive and hear, in your own voice and in the voices of others, that you have authentically moved and informed an authentic audience is central to writing motivation and success.

This reading aloud of student work should begin in the early sessions of the semester. Toward the end of the semester it should take an increasing share of class time. The emphasis on rewriting should be intensive, from the expansion of journal entries to the reorganizing of essay drafts.

Recall and Comment

Now, with Recall and Recall and Comment activities, we process the written language and its message through another mode, that of short-term memory and, eventually, of intermediate and long-term memory. Without memory, learning cannot occur. Without memory, we cannot get from

one end of a sentence to the other, let alone through the development of a movement of writing. It is not for nothing that the mother of the muses is the goddess of memory, Mnemosyne. When we sit down to write, we are what we can recall, use, and develop, however well, however haltingly, however sub-consciously. Again, we use the power of speech, to develop memorable principles of the use of written language out of the stimulated and coached behavioral repertory of the students themselves.

In Recall and Comment, the teacher coaches the students (1) to recall something that came through clearly in the reading and tell it again as if it were happening again, as close to the texts as they remember it, so the audience can see or be aware of it and so the student speaker and listeners can be also reinforced in awareness of it, and then (2) to make some comment on whatever he or she noticed, or is just now noticing or beginning to notice, whatever particularly took his or her attention about the way the writing or some facet of it was told and what it was telling, rather than simply saying "I liked it" or "I didn't like it" or discussing it in a way that quickly becomes distant from perception of the principles of effective written language.

Students must be coached to feel free to give whatever comment, no matter how dumb or accidental seeming. Many connections and differences bewteen speaking and writing are discovered. The student's seeing and re-seeing of the recalled material pulls upon his or her comments, upon areas of the mind that are not usually brought to bear in most classroom discussion. It is a reinforcing and rewarding activity, a discovery and awakening activity. Actively guided and coached by the teacher, Recall

and Comment bring out many useful insights, in the students' own perception and language, that would not have occurred in any other way.

Throughout the Recall and Comment activity, the teacher "teases," coaches, students to develop their own subject matter for the form of writing that is the focus of the class effort.

Time Frame

I interject at this point an observation on how these activities can be carried out in the weekly time frame of classes. If your class meets three times a week, one hour each time, you can do the Oral Reading of the models in the first session, Recall and Comment in the second, and the Inclass Oral Telling, Writing, and Readback in the third. If you have a three or four hour class, you can build the activities efficiently in the one session. (See The Teacher's Manual for Writing from Start to Finish, by John Schultz, Boynton/Cook, Montclair, N.J., 1983, for a full discussion of these activities and their coachings.)

Inclass Audience-Focused Oral Telling, Writing, and Readback Activity

This activity, moving from oral telling/rehearsal to writing and then to readback of the writing, is the engine for the locomotive development of individual and class work over the course of a semester or quarter. It takes significant steps to move the power of speech strongly into the formal conventions of writing. In "The Friendly, Demanding Audience of the Story Workshop-Taught Class--The Use of the Immediate Audience in the Teaching of Writing," Betty Shiflett emphasizes that the "palpable hook-up

between student writer and live audience" is never left "up to chance or good luck," for the teacher/coach remains a key figure in a well-structured strategy.[7]

For instance, the teacher coaches a student to pick out someone in the semi-circle and address the writing to that picked person as "Dear Anne or Dear Al or whoever," taking thus an immediate step into the formal conventions and situations of writing, yet a step that is friendly to the writer and the addressee. When we make this friendly formalization of the context of the inclass writing, we gain both the advantages of use of broad peer language resources and the different advantages and constraints of more formal written structures. The steps of the activity, and the very forms of writing with in-built sense of address that are being developed in the activity, pull the students' speech into the written mode.

The teacher continues, through coaching, to "tease" the students with suggestions for developing subject matter. So, at the same time that we have a teller and listener at work, the mental rehearsal of the listening audience is also stimulated.

Whether or not the subject is a how-to or an academic researched effort, the writer is coached to tell out loud, explore, what he or she sees, perceives, thinks, has to say about the subject, however incomplete. The immediate audience focus puts pressure on the teller to organize effectively what he or she has to say about the subject, and the teacher's coaching exploits this pressure. The student is further distanced from dependence upon the immediate speech context in that the addressee is

listening to what is being told to her or him, and feels the specialness of the audience focus, but does not respond as one would in an ordinary speech context.

The teacher coaches the teller to give examples or illustrations or topic statements that will help get what the writer has to say about the subject across to the receiver. Finally, the teacher may coach the addressee to ask questions of the teller about whatever has aroused curiosity or need. If the writer has used an effective gesture in the oral telling, then the teacher coaches the teller to remember that some other correspondence, such as metaphor, verbs, or other devices, must be used in writing.

In fulfilling these friendly, formalizing steps that move thinking and the power of speech into the conventions of writing, the writer gets the unique chance to develop a direct sense of the audience at an early stage. Students also see that re-forming and re-organizing, in mental and oral rehearsal, occur before pencil is put to paper, and that pre-writing, writing, and rewriting interpenetrate each other.

Each step of the activity helps the writer nourish the inner sounding and listening self or selves, the immediate audience that the writer must have when writing alone, to mediate from thinking to audience through language, to put words in order for future readers.

While the teacher coaches the teller through the oral telling, the rest of the class listens and learns through listening, their subjects and their anticipation of telling and writing stimulated, for their turn is coming. A sense of cooperation operates along with a healthy sense

of competition. The activity has many characteristics of linguistically negotiated play, which is crucial in children's acquisition of language proficiency.[8] The teacher as coach gives reinforcing expressions, perhaps simply saying "Good, good" at appropriate developments, but also letting the interest of the audience, expressed in many ways, give main reinforcement, too.

Depending on the time available, the teacher coaches other tellings with other students, though time limitations may require that the tellings be brief, even down to one-liners, which simply get the student to focus on a picked addressee, hear her or his voice tell something about the subject, enough to carry some sense of audience focus and listening into the writing. The teacher divides the class time among the oral telling step, the inclass writing step, and the readback step. In a three or four hour class, more time may be spent on the oral tellings and the readback. In a one hour class, the time would be divided about equally among the three steps.

The Inclass Writing

The teacher moves the students into the inclass writing, continuing the friendly formalizing steps that bring the power of speech into the use of written language. The teacher coaches the students to put the name of their addressee at the top of the page, "Dear so and so," and then to tell in writing to that person what came out in the oral telling and continue it in writing. The teacher coaches the students to keep in mind their addressee, look up at the addressee now and then, and tell to

the page what you have to say or argue about the subject, so your addressee can understand it, "can get it," so to speak. "Listen to your voice as you tell it to the page." The teacher coaches the students to use whatever was effective in their oral tellings and to use unabashedly whatever they heard that was effective in principle in other students' oral tellings--examples, illustrations, imagery, topic statements, whatever, giving specific references as he or she coaches in an unobtrusive way. In any case, the students become rapidly accustomed to the teacher's voice coming from the side, reminding, suggesting. Some students take immediate advantage of the side-coaching, some become so concentrated on what they're writing that they do not hear the general coachings given to the class, or the specific coachings to individuals, except with a sort of peripheral awareness. After a few minutes the teacher probably goes quiet and becomes simply a listening presence to the activity of several students writing.

The students have been coached from the beginning of the activity to regard the inclass writing as the beginning of a piece of writing that they will take home and finish. They are coached to carry the sense of the immediate audience of the class, their addressees, into the situation where they write alone, finish the piece alone, fictionalizing the audience from the responsive faces of the class, including the face and presence of the teacher, thus stimulating and building their capacity for inner sounding and listening while they write.

The Readback

When the teacher asks students to read their inclass writing aloud, he or she would like to have every student read aloud, but in any case, in whatever time is available, tries to make sure that some of the best student writers as well as the poorer ones are heard, the good and the struggling as it is interspersed in most of the writings. The students hear their own writings in their own voices in the presence of an audience.

In the Readback, students hear immediately the transfer of what occurred in the oral tellings, what occurred in the pre-writing mental and oral rehearsal and build-up. In almost every case, there will be effective written language behavior to recognize and build upon, however small. In some cases, the teacher gives an overtly rewarding comment, but usually the students' hearing of their own voices in the immediate responsive audience context provides a deep personal pleasure and excitement that builds confidence and integrates skills. The audience also hears occasionally the difference between an effective oral telling and an awkward follow-up writing that does not make good use of what was rhetorically effective in the oral telling. The teacher can coach immediately to what was more effective in the oral telling, so that when the student takes the piece home to continue writing it, she or he can recapitulate the oral telling and take advantage of its effective beginnings.

The Inclass Immediate Audience-Focused Oral Telling, Writing, and Readback activity breaks down the walls of "privatization" and "pluralistic ignorance" that so unfortunately characterizes most people's knowledge of writing process. Through this opening up and expansion of their

own and other peer-writers' writing processes, students get a view and experience of writing potentials, thinking brought into the open, trial runs, coachings for effective use of rhetorical principles, and compare more effective written language approaches and moments with the less effective ones. The activity replicates the condition of reading the spoken language that one is most familiar with, that is, one's own speech written down. Through the oral reading of the models and the coaching reminders during the inclass telling and writing in discourse forms shaped by those readings, we replicate the conditions of reading and hearing the written language produced by other more mature users of the written mode. We see the fulfillment of the research that tells us that much writing instruction should occur during the process of writing through side-coaching, rather than after the fact of writing. We provide students with compelling social context and audience focus, which they are explicitly coached to use at home, when writing alone, to cope with written language's absence of a speech context, change in medium, and absence of the primary audience. The student begins to build, i.e., fictionalize their inner sounding and listening from imagining the responsive faces of their addressees in the class. The internal sounding and listening that must be actively present for writers when they are writing alone is seen to have profoundly social origin. These activities stimulate the integrative motivations necessary for language acquisition, the desire to belong effectively to a group of people, to be able to use written language as effectively as members of peer groups use oral language. The dramatic classroom audience context gives immediate reward

to what students do well, because they do better if they are rewarded quickly for what they do well. To withhold praise, or to keep writing silent, until the student has achieved an ideal performance is educationally unsound. In these inclass activities, students and teacher experience the power of speech brought to bear upon writing, and also see how imaginative invention is demanded of the writer in making the constant transfer back and forth between the capacities of the two overlapping media of speech and writing. They see and hear how paralingual expression, such as gesture, tone, and facial expression, must be realized with other correspondences in writing, through metaphors, verbs, imagery, sequence, and so forth. Taking advantage of the broadest and best language resources that the student brings to the classroom, written expression becomes better formed. The student's regard for written language as an alien power is overcome and written language becomes more familiar. As the sense of written language's alien power dissipates, the students develop more confidence and authority with the written mode. The chained specifications of students' written language development, of connections and contrasts of speech and writing, must continue through the completion of writing done at home, the oral reading of selected student writing in the class, conferencing, style, punctuation, grammar activities, and very importantly rewriting, in all of which the power of speech, voice, is crucial to realizing the potentials of the writing effort. If the chain is broken, if say the inclass activity is used simply as an entertainment for its own sake and is not connected to the student's other writing situations, the power of the learning effort is disrupted.

In an empirical study conducted by Mary Zoe Keithley, a Master of Arts student in the Teaching of Writing at Columbia College in Chicago, students identify the following factors as having been particularly helpful in the development of their writing: Coaching to use your own voice, 93%; Hearing other students' work read aloud in class, 90%; Hearing their own work read aloud in class, 89%; Conference with instructor, 85%; Reading aloud of models, 84%; and Recall, 82%. "Coaching to use your own voice," i.e., the power of speech, is identified by students as the single most important factor in the development of their writing.

The basic steps and basic coachings of the Inclass Oral Telling, Writing, and Readback Activity, and of the whole repertoire of activities interrelating thinking, speaking, listening, reading, writing, recalling, and immediate audience focus, must be carried out without equivocation to gain the activities' power in developing the writing ability of students. In other words, in Piaget's terms, when you shift from a current-traditional classroom approach to this process-and-audience oriented approach, you cannot simply assimilate a change here and there but must accommodate a major underlying, over-arching, embracing alteration of philosophy and method that affects the design and detail of everything you do. In-service training can be wonderfully helpful for groups of teachers.

When students are engaged in full tasks of writing to and for real and immediate audiences, they absorb knowledge of the many aspects of the skill. In a rather short time, they show real competence with it and are better able, because of the development of their inner listening, to

organize and develop effective written expression for more remote (or more profoundly internal) audiences.

Notes

1. Robert Zoellner, "Talk-Write," A Behavioral Pedagogy for Composition," College English, Vol. 30, No. 4, January 1969, p. 270.

2. Betty Ramberg, "Composition Instruction Does Make a Difference," Research in the Teaching of English, Vol. 12, No. 1, February 1978.

3. Brian Cambourne, "Oral and Written Relationships: A Reading Perspective," in Exploring Speaking-Writing Relationships: Connections and Contrasts, eds. Barry M. Kroll and Robert J. Vann. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1981.

4. Charles R. Cooper and Lee Odell, "Considerations of Sound in the Composing Process of Published Writers," Research in the Teaching of English, Vol. 10, No. 2, Fall 1976.

5. Walter Ong, "The Writer's Audience is Always a Fiction," PMLA 90, January 1975.

6. Robert Zoellner, ibid., p. 296.

7. Betty Shiflett, "The Friendly, Demanding Audience of the Story Workshop-Taught Class--The Use of the Immediate Audience in Teaching Writing," CCCC presentation, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1985, p. 1.

8. A. D. Pellegrini, "The Construction of Cohesive Text by Pre-Schoolers in Two Play Contexts," Discourse Processes, Norwood, NJ, Vol. 5, 1982, p. 107.

Bibliography

Basgoy, Ilhan. "The Tale-Singer and His Audience." Folklore: Performance and Communication, ed., Amos, Don Ben and Goldstein, Kenneth S., Mouton, 1975.

Beck, Ariadne. "Phases in the Development of Structure in Therapy and Encounter Groups," in Innovations in Client-Centered Therapy, D. Wexler & L. N. Rice, eds. New York: Wiley Interscience, 1974.

Becker, Howard S. "Freshman English for Graduate Students: A Memoir and Two Theories," (earlier version: "Sociologists' Writing Problems") unpublished but well-circulated among graduate sociology students.

Bolinger, Dwight. Aspects of Language. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1975.

Britton, James. Language and Learning. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin, 1970.

_____. "The Composing Process and the Function of Writing." Research on Composing, ed., C. Cooper and L. Odell. Urbana, Illinois: NCTE, 1978.

_____, Burgess, T., Martin, N., McLeod, A., and Rosen, H. The Development of Writing Abilities: 11-18. London: Macmillan-Collier, 1975.

Chao, Yuan Ken. Language and Symbolic Systems. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1968.

Cooper, C. R. and Odell, L. Research on Composing: Points of Departure. Urbana, Illinois: NCTE, 1978.

Dillon, D. and Searle, D. "The Role of Language in One First Grade Classroom," in Research in the Teaching of English, Vol. 15, No. 4, December 1981.

Diringer, David. The Alphabet. 2 vol. London: Hutchinson, 1968.

Dohlinow, Phyllis Jay and Bishop, Naomi. "The Development of Motor Skills and Social Relationships Among Primates Through Play," Primate Patterns, ed. by Phyllis Dohlinow. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1972.

Emit, Janet. The Composing Processes of Twelfth Graders. NCTE Research Report No. 13. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1972.

Falk, Julia. "Language Acquisition and the Teaching and Learning of Writing." College English, December 1979.

Florio, Susan and Clark, Christopher M. "The Functions of Writing in an Elementary Classroom." Research in the Teaching of English. Vol. 16, No. 2, May 1982.

Fodor, Jerry A. The Language of Thought. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1975.

Gardner, Howard. The Shattered Mind. New York: Vintage Books, Random House, Inc., 1975.

_____. "The Making of a Storyteller." Psychology Today. March 1982.

Gee, Thomas C. "Students' Responses to Teacher Comments." Research in the Teaching of English, Vol. 6, No. 2, Fall 1972.

Gelb, I. G. A Study of Writing. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963.

Halpern, Jeanne W. "Differences Between Speaking and Writing and Their Implications for Teaching." College Composition and Communication. Vol. 35, October 1984.

Hartwell, Patrick. "Dialect Interference in Writing: A Critical View." Research in the Teaching of English, Vol. 14, No. 2, May 1980.

Havelock, Eric A. Preface to Plato. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1963.

Hildyard, Angela and Olson, David R. "Memory and Interference in the Comprehension of Oral and Written Discourse." Discourse Processes, Vol. 1, April-June 1978.

Hogan, Thomas P. "Students' Interests in Writing Activities." Research in the Teaching of English, Vol. 14, No. 2, May 1980.

King, Martha and Rentel, Victor. "Toward a Theory of Early Writing Development." Research in the Teaching of English. Vol. 13, No. 3, October 1979.

Kroll, Barry M. and Vann, Robert J., eds. Exploring Speaking-Writing Relationships: Connections and Contrasts. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1981.

Labov, William. Language in the Inner City: Studies in the Black English Vernacular. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1972.

Moffett, James. Teaching in the Universe of Discourse. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1968.

Mosenthal, Peter, Davidson-Mosenthal, Randie, and Krieger, Veronica. "How Fourth Graders Develop Points of View in Classroom Writing." Research in the Teaching of English, Vol. 15, No. 3, October 1981.

Murray, Donald. "Internal Revision." In Cooper, Charles and Odell, Lee, eds., Research on Composing. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1978.

Ong, Walter J., S.J. Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word. London and New York: Methuen, 1982.

Paivio, Allan T. Imagery and Verbal Processes. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1971.

Ramberg, Betty. "Composition Instruction Does Make a Difference." Research in the Teaching of English, Vol. 12, No. 1, February 1978.

_____. "Composition in the Secondary English Curriculum: Some Current Trends and Directions for the Eighties." Research in the Teaching of English, Vol. 15, No. 3, October 1981.

Rose, Mike. "Rigid Rules, Inflexible Plans, and the Stifling of Language: A Cognitive Analysis of Writer's Block." NCTE Promising Research Award Speech. Rose finds that blocking writers pause longer than non-blocking writers. November 1981.

Rosenberg, Bruce A. "Oral Sermons and Oral Narrative." In Folklore: Performance and Communication, ed., Dan Ben-Amos and Kenneth S. Goldstein, New York: Mouton, 1975.

Schultz, John. "The Story Workshop Method: Writing from Start to Finish." College English, December 1977.

_____. "Conversation with John Schultz," interview in Chicago Review, 1977.

_____. "Story Workshop," in Research on Composing: Points of Departure, ed., Charles Cooper and Lee Odell. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1978.

_____. Writing from Start to Finish: The "Story Workshop" Basic Forms Rhetoric-Reader. Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook, 1983.

_____. The Teacher's Manual for Writing from Start to Finish. Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook, 1983.

Shiflett, Betty. "Story Workshop as a Method of Teaching Writing." College English, November 1973.

Shiflett, Betty. "The Friendly, Demanding Audience of the Story Workshop-Taught Class--The Use of the Immediate Audience in Teaching Writing," CCCC Presentation, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1985.

Spolin, Viola. Improvisation for the Theater. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1963.

Stallard, Charles K. "An Analysis of the Writing Behavior of Good Student Writers." Research in the Teaching of English, Vol. 8, No. 2, Summer 1974.

Strickland, Dorothy S. "A Program for Linguistically Different, Black Children." Research in the Teaching of English, Vol. 7, No. 1, Spring 1973.

Vygotsky, Lev Semenovich. Thought and Language. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1962. (Originally published 1934)

Zoellner, Robert. "Talk-Write: A Behavioral Pedagogy for Composition." College English, Vol. 30, No. 4, January 1969.